



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,696	09/04/2003	Woong-Kyu Min	YOM-0054	8570
7590 Cantor Colburn LLP 55 Griffin Road South Bloomfield, CT 06002	09/20/2007		EXAMINER MOON, SEOKYUN	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/656,696	MIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Seokyun Moon	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-12 and 18-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 13-17 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3-5 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 March 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/16/07.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The Applicants' arguments filed on June 27, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the Applicants' arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The Applicants pointed out that Funamoto (US 2003/0142118) does not teach "*controlling the on-time of the lamp driving signal in response to at least one of the vertical synchronization signal and the vertical synchronization start signal*" since the modulation pulse generated by the generators 16 or 18 merely synchronize with the vertical synchronizing signal, but form no basis for selection of the modulation pulse generated by the selector 20. However, as acknowledged by the Applicants, Funamoto teaches synchronizing the modulation pulse with the vertical synchronizing signal. Thus, in the device of Funamoto, the starting timing of the on-time of the lamp driving signal is controlled by the vertical synchronizing signal.

For the combination of Wei and Funamoto, the Examiner merely applied the idea of Funamoto, synchronizing the lamp driving signal with the vertical synchronizing signal to the device of Wei and, for the combination of Wei, Funamoto, and Lee, the Examiner used the idea of Lee, outputting the vertical synchronization start signal from the signal controller.

Therefore, the combination of Wei, Funamoto, and Lee would be obvious and still teaches all the limitation of the currently amended claims 1 and 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1 and 2** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei (US 2003/01375485), Funamoto (US 2003/0142118), and further in view of Lee (US 2002/0057247).

As to **claim 1**, Wei [fig. 3] teaches an inverter (“*light source modulator 42*”) for a liquid crystal display [abstract lines 1-2], the inverter comprising:

an inverter controller (“*pulse width modulation controller 58*”) [fig. 3] generating a lamp driving signal (“*PWM signal 59*”) having on-time and off-time by pulse width modulating a dimming signal (“*feedback signal 56*”) [par. (0023) lines 12-18 and fig. 3, wherein the feedback signal 56 is inputted into the pulse width modulation controller 58, and then a modulated signal, PWM signal 59 corresponding to the pulse width of the feedback signal is outputted from the controller];

a power switching element (“*Q4*”) [fig. 3] selectively transmitting a DC voltage (“*V_M*”) in response to a signal (“*PWM signal 59*”) from the inverter controller (“*light source modulator 42*”) [par. (0023) lines 18-24]; and

a voltage booster (“*transformer T2*”) for driving a lamp (“*back light source 38*”) in response to a signal from the switching element [par. (0023) lines 22-24].

Wei does not expressly disclose the inverter controller to generate a carrier signal for pulse width modulation and to modulate the dimming signal based on the carrier signal.

However, the Examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to use a carrier signal such as a sawtooth waveform or a triangle wave form in order to modulate a signal, in pulse width modulation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the inverter controller of the display of Wei to generate a carrier signal internally and to modulate the dimming signal based on the carrier signal, in order to allow the controller of the display of Wei to adjust the intervals between modulated pulses by controlling the carrier signal, and thus to optimize signal transmission.

Wei as modified above does not teach that the on-time of the lamp driving signal is controlled in response to at least one of a vertical synchronization signal and a vertical synchronization start signal.

However, Funamoto [fig. 4] teaches an idea of synchronizing a lamp driving signal with a vertical synchronization signal, in a liquid crystal display.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the display of Wei as modified above to synchronize on-time of the lamp driving signal with a vertical synchronization signal, as taught by Funamoto, in order to output appropriate brightness level according to the image to be displayed.

Wei as modified by Funamoto inherently teaches a means (i.e. signal controller) for providing the vertical synchronization signal since the display of Wei as modified by Funamoto discloses that a vertical synchronization signal is fed to the inverter controller [Funamoto: fig. 3].

Wei as modified by Funamoto does not disclose a vertical synchronization start signal being provided by the signal controller.

However, Lee [fig. 3] discloses a timing controller ("timing controller 100") providing a vertical synchronization start signal [par. (0121)].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the signal controller of Wei as modified by Funamoto to output a vertical synchronization start signal, as well as a vertical synchronization signal, as taught by Lee, in order to allow the display of Wei

Art Unit: 2629

as modified by Funamoto to adjust and to optimize the timings of driving gate scanning lines, and thus to prevent flickers or image degradation of the display.

As to **claim 2**, Wei [fig. 3] teaches that the dimming signal ("feedback signal 56") being provided from an external device ("feedback circuit 36").

Allowable Subject Matter

4. **Claims 3-5** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
5. **Claims 13-17** are allowed.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Seokyun Moon whose telephone number is (571) 272-5552. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (572) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

September 5, 2007

- s.m.



SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER